Response to Restriction Requirement U.S. Application No. 10/630,220 Page 14 of 14

RESPONSE

In response to the outstanding Restriction Requirement dated March 22, 2006, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, claims 2-21 and 27-28. For a restriction requirement to be valid, the Examiner must establish that there is no inventive concept between the claims. (M.P.E.P § 1893.03(d)). Applicants assert that, for example, the claims of Groups I and VI all require a medium for growth of a high density cell culture. For example, claim 17 of group I and claim 37 (group VI) are directed to such a medium. Further, Group VII and Group IX also requires a medium for cell culture. Therefore, the examination of all groups would necessitate searching the subject matter of Groups I-IX, and therefore it would not pose an undue burden to search these claims. Further, Applicants respectfully note that the claims of Group I are not all limited to a exogenously regulated expression system, as the Office Action states. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request examination of all these claims simultaneously.

The Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute species not elected herein in other patent applications claiming the benefit of the filing date of this application. Furthermore, the Applicants understand that upon allowance of generic claim 1, they will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional Groups which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of any allowed generic claims.

Any questions raised by this submission may be directed to the undersigned at (617) 570-8743. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayments, or credit any overpayments, to our **Deposit Account No. 07-1700**.

Date: May 22, 2006 Reg. No. 50,356

Tel. No.: (617) 570-8743 Fax No.: (617) 523-1231

LIBC/2765112.1

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa C. Kavanaugh Attorney for Applicants Goodwin Procter LLP

Exchange Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02109